

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 06878 01 OF 02 052006Z
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00

INRE-00 /026 W

-----029098 052128Z /61

P 051928Z MAY 78

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9275

S E C R E T SECTION 01 OF 02 GENEVA 06878

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 212, MAY 5, 1978

(SALT TWO-1721)

REFS: A. SALT TWO-1714

B. SALT TWO-1716

SUMMARY. SIDES PURSUED DISCUSSION OF U.S. HEAVY BOMBER PROPOSALS, WITH U.S. RESPONDING IN DETAIL TO SOVIET QUESTIONS OF APRIL 28. U.S. ALSO TABLED LANGUAGE FOR ARTS.

II.3, XI.3, AND FINAL PARAGRAPH OF PROTOCOL, AS PRESENTED IN MAY 3 PLENARY, AND REAFFIRMED ITS POSITION ON ART. V.2. SIDES ALSO EXCHANGED JDT PAGES, INCLUDING AGREED TEXT OF NON-CIRCUMVENTION PROVISION IN ART. XII, AS TABLED IN SAME PLENARY. END SUMMARY.

1. PEREZ RESPONDED TO SIX QUESTIONS POSED BY KARPOV AT APRIL 28 MEETING OF DRAFTING GROUP (REF A). REGARDING WHO WOULD DECIDE ON COOPERATIVE MEASURES, HE NOTED THAT ACTIONS OF THE SIDES WOULD DETERMINE IF SUCH MEASURES WERE APPROPRIATE. SIDES SHOULD UNDERTAKE IN FUTURE TO DESIGN AIR-

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 06878 01 OF 02 052006Z

PLANES WITH FRODS VERIFIABLE BY NTM. IN ITS OWN INTERESTS, SIDE WOULD BE EXPECTED TO SEEK TO ESTABLISH DISTINCTION BASED ON FRODS BETWEEN THOSE AIRPLANES LIMITED BY SALT AND THOSE WITH SAME BASIC AIRFRAME WHICH ARE NOT. OTHER SIDE CAN ACCEPT SUCH DISTINCTION OR RAISE ISSUE OF SUFFICIENCY. IF SO, FIRST SIDE HAD AT LEAST THREE CHOICES: A) ALTER OB-SERVABLE FEATURES TO ENSURE THAT THEY PROVIDE FRODS; B)

OFFER OR UNDERTAKE COOPERATIVE MEASURES CONFIRMING THEY ARE FRODS RATHER THAN MERELY OBSERVABLE DIFFERENCES, AND/OR OFFER OR UNDERTAKE SUCH MEASURES AS WOULD ASSIST IN CONFIRMING CAPABILITY OR LACK OF CAPABILITY OF AIRPLANE IN QUESTION; C) AGREE THAT ALL AIRPLANES OF TYPE IN QUESTION BE COUNTED. KARPOV ASKED FOR CLARIFICATION BETWEEN FRODS AND OBSERVABLE DIFFERENCES NOT FUNCTIONALLY RELATED. PEREZ NOTED THAT FRODS SHOULD INDICATE THAT AIRPLANE IN QUESTION NOT CAPABLE OF MISSION OF HEAVY BOMBER OR LONG-RANGE CRUISE MISSILE CARRIER. LT. COL. JOHNSON ADDED THAT WITH RESPECT TO CRUISE MISSILE CARRIERS, HIGHER TAIL ON ONE AIRCRAFT WOULD NOT BE FROD BUT THAT LARGE OPENING IN SIDE OF ANOTHER AIRPLANE TO PERMIT LAUNCHING CRUISE MISSILES COULD CREATE FRODS. PEREZ CONCLUDED THAT COOPERATIVE MEASURES WERE TO BE VOLUNTARY AND THEIR USE AND EFFICACY WOULD BE DETERMINED ON CASE-BY-CASE BASIS.

2. PEREZ NOTED THAT THERE IS NO SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IDEA OF COOPERATIVE MEASURES AND BUILDING AIRPLANES FROM SCRATCH AS CMCS. CHOICES WOULD REMAIN AS INDICATED ABOVE.

3. U.S. ENVISAGES CONVERSION AS TAKING EXISTING AIRPLANE, NOT OTHERWISE A HEAVY BOMBER, AND EQUIPPING IT FOR LONG-RANGE CRUISE MISSILES. DURING CONVERSION FRODS WOULD BE CREATED. ANY AIRPLANE, WHETHER IT WAS JUST CONSTRUCTED OR SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 GENEVA 06878 01 OF 02 052006Z

HAD BEEN IN USE, COULD BE CONVERTED. IF AIRPLANE, NOT OTHERWISE SUBJECT TO SALT LIMITATIONS, WERE EQUIPPED FOR CRUISE MISSILES DURING PRODUCTION, IT WOULD BE SAID TO BE NEWLY CONSTRUCTED, NOT CONVERTED. CMCS WHICH DID NOT HAVE AIRFRAME SIMILAR TO AIRPLANES NOT SALT-LIMITED COULD ALSO BE NEWLY CONSTRUCTED. U.S. MAKES NO DISTINCTION BETWEEN CONVERTED AND NEWLY CONSTRUCTED AIRPLANES SINCE FRODS CONCEPT APPLIES TO BOTH. HOWEVER, HE NOTED, SOVIET SIDE DOES MAKE A DISTINCTION IN DISCUSSING CONVERSATIONS IN ARTICLE VIII. WHAT DOES SOVIET SIDE MEAN BY "CONVERSION"? KARPOV REPLIED CHARACTERISTICALLY WITH QUESTION AS TO WHY U.S. SAW SPECIAL PROBLEM WITH REGARD TO PARAGRAPH VIII RATHER THAN OTHER PARTS OF JDT. HE AGREED, HOWEVER, TO STUDY QUESTION, AS WELL AS U.S. EXPLANATIONS, AND RETURN TO IT LATER.

4. PEREZ CONTINUED THAT U.S. HAD SAID CMC B-52S WILL BE DISTINGUISHABLE FROM OTHER B-52S, WHICH IS THE RELEVANT DISTINCTION. RE SRAM LAUNCHERS, HE REPEATED THAT LONG-RANGE CRUISE MISSILES CURRENTLY PLANNED FOR DEPLOYMENT ON B-52S WILL NOT FIT ON EXISTING SRAM LAUNCHERS. KARPOV REQUESTED DETAILS OR FEATURES OF SRAM LAUNCHERS ASKING

"CAN WE HAVE A LOOK AT SRAM LAUNCHERS?" HE ADDED THAT U.S. PUBLISHED SOURCES INDICATED THAT SRAM LAUNCHERS WOULD BE VERY GOOD FOR CRUISE MISSILES. PEREZ NOTED THAT WHAT HE HAD SAID REPRESENTED A CHANGE IN U.S. PLANS. KARPOV THEN ASKED WHETHER CHANGE WAS IN MISSILE OR LAUNCHER. U.S. INDICATED IT NOT PREPARED TO REPLY NOW BUT THAT CURRENTLY PLANNED MISSILES WOULD NOT FIT ON EXISTING SRAM LAUNCHERS.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 06878 02 OF 02 052005Z
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00

INRE-00 /026 W

-----029064 052130Z /61

P 051928Z MAY 78

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9276

S E C R E T SECTION 02 OF 02 GENEVA 06878

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

5. IN REPLY TO SOVIET QUESTION AS TO WHETHER AIRPLANE WITH MORE THAN 20 CRUISE MISSILES SHOULD BE COUNTED AS MORE THAN ONE IN AGGREGATE, THE ANSWER WAS "NO." KARPOV COMMENTED THAT THIS WAS VERY SHORT ANSWER. PERHAPS U.S. COULD THINK ABOUT IT A BIT LONGER.

6. U.S. CONSIDERS TUPOLEV ASW (TU-142) AND TUPOLEV (TU-95) TO BE OF SAME TYPE BECAUSE THEY HAVE SAME BASIC AIRFRAME, AND, UNLIKE RE-CONNAISSANCE VERSIONS, THERE IS NOTHING IN OBSERVABLE FEATURES OF ASW MODELS WHICH INDICATE THEY CANNOT PERFORM MISSION OF HEAVY BOMBER. U.S. HAS PROPOSED AS SPECIAL CASE THAT BEAR ASWS NOT BE COUNTED AND DOESN'T UNDERSTAND SOVIET PROBLEM IN THIS REGARD. KARPOV SAID PROBLEM IS WITH PRINCIPLE OF APPROACH. TU-142 ASW AIRPLANES HAVE DIFFERENT DIMENSIONS FOR FUSELAGE AND CHASSIS GONDOLAS THAN TU-95 HEAVY BOMBERS. WHY IS THERE ONE RULE FOR B-52S AND ANOTHER FOR THE TU-142? PEREZ POINTED OUT THAT DIFFERENCES KARPOV HAD CITED WERE INSUFFICIENT TO NEGATE

ABILITY OF BEAR ASW TO PERFORM HEAVY BOMBER FUNCTION. U.S., THEREFORE, PROPOSED AN EXCEPTION FOR THIS ASW AIRPLANE AND FOR B-52S WHICH ARE NOT CMCS. JOHNSON ADDED WITH RESPECT

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 06878 02 OF 02 052005Z

TO THE EXCEPTION FOR B-52S AND BEAR ASW THAT U.S. IS NOT SAYING OUR AIRPLANES ARE DIFFERENT TYPES AND YOURS ARE NOT. WE ARE SAYING INSTEAD THAT, FOR PURPOSES OF THE TREATY, BOTH ARE "CONSIDERED" TO BE DIFFERENT TYPES. BEAR ASWS WON'T COUNT IN AGGREGATE. IN ADDITION, BEAR RECCE VERSIONS, WHICH ALSO HAVE SAME BASIC AIRFRAME BUT DO HAVE FRODS, ARE DIFFERENT TYPES FROM HEAVY BOMBERS BECAUSE OF THESE FRODS AND THEY WOULD NOT COUNT.

7. IN CONCLUSION, PEREZ TABLED U.S. PROPOSALS PRESENTED IN MAY 3 PLENARY (ARTS. II.3, XI.3, AND THE FINAL PARAGRAPH OF THE PROTOCOL) AND REAFFIRMED U.S. POSITION ON ARTICLE V.2 (REF B). ON LATTER POINT, KARPOV SAID HE UNDERSTOOD U.S. POSITION BUT THEY HAVE DIFFERENT POINT OF VIEW. SIDES ALSO EXCHANGED JDT PAGES 37 (AGREED TEXT OF ARTICLE XII ON NON-CIRCUMVENTION) AND 21 (ON WHICH ACHIEVEMENT IN SUBGROUP ON MAY 4 OF NEWLY AGREED REVISED VERSION OF PARAGRAPH 4 OF ARTICLE IV AND COMMON UNDERSTANDING THERETO IS SHOWN: WORD "INTERNAL" DELETED FROM WHERE IT PREVIOUSLY APPEARED AS MODIFIER OF WORDS "DIAMETER" AND "DEPTH").

8. NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR MONDAY, MAY 8. EARL

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptoning: Z
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MEETINGS, SALT (ARMS CONTROL), NUCLEAR BOMBS, MEETING REPORTS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 05 may 1978
Decaption Date: 20 Mar 2014
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978GENEVA06878
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780192-1030
Format: TEL
From: GENEVA USSALTTWO
Handling Restrictions:
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t19780590/aaaacyoj.tel
Line Count: 202
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 57d9cba3-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: 78 SALT TALKS 1714, 78 SALT TALKS 1716
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 01 aug 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2783845
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 212, MAY 5, 1978 (SALT TWO-1721)
TAGS: PARM, US
To: STATE
Type: TE
vdkvgwkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/57d9cba3-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014